UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

ALL-INDIA NUMBER

Mahatma Gandhi's Views on Education - - - - *Haridas T. Muzumdar*

India and World Peace - *Jabez T. Sunderland*

Social Practices in India - *Curtis W. Reese*

When You Go to India - *Alson H. Robinson*

What Can We Learn from History? - - - - *Reginald A. Reynolds*

Caste and Industrial Progress - - - - - - *C. A. Phadkar*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXVIII NUMBER 3

Chicago, October 5, 1936

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 43

ARTICLES—

Selected—Gandhi 43
Max Müller 58
Mahatma Gandhi's Views on Education—HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR 46
India and World Peace—JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND 48
Social Practices in India—CURTIS W. REESE 50
When You Go to India—ALSON H. ROBINSON 51
What Can We Learn from History?—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS ... 54
Caste and Industrial Progress—C. A. PHADKAR 56

POETRY—

A Hindu Prayer—BASANTA KOOMAR ROY 49

THE STUDY TABLE—

Hindu Philosophy—TARAKNATH DAS 57
Rammohun Roy—CHARLES LYTTLE 57

THE FIELD—

Ambedkar and the Sikhs—P. OOMMAN PHILIP in the *Christian Century* 42
India Is on Its Way—*World Events* 59

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Ambedkar and the Sikhs

(An article by P. Oomman Philip in the *Christian Century*)

It is now eleven months since Dr. Ambedkar declared an open revolt against Hinduism. He has been influencing his people, the depressed classes, to renounce Hinduism. He announced that this would take two or three years, after which a decision would be taken on the new religion to be embraced. Quite a cleavage has arisen among the depressed classes on the question. Several of the leaders of that community have made public statements disagreeing with Dr. Ambedkar and pointing out that the best way to get social and other disabilities removed is to remain within Hinduism and fight for their rights as Hindus. They recognize the great change that is coming over the higher castes in their attitude towards the depressed classes and believe that whatever disabilities they suffer from now will soon be removed by the combined efforts of Hindu reformers and the leaders of the depressed classes.

Moslem and Sikh leaders approached Dr. Ambedkar and invited him and his people into their respective religions, making extravagant promises as to what they would do for them, socially and politically. Some Christian missionaries were also carried off their feet and thought that Dr. Ambedkar was going to bring into the Christian church millions of the depressed classes. They interviewed him several times and gave it out as their opinion that he was going to become a Christian and not a Moslem or Sikh, and that he would influence his people also to become Christians. They sent glowing accounts of him and his leadership to America and England. Based on these, the officials of mission boards in America and England, it is reported, have been stirred to action and are thinking of making special appeals for more men and money to meet what they believe to be an unparalleled evangelistic opportunity.

Indians, both Christian and non-Christian, who may be expected to appraise at their true value men and things in India, have been

(*Continued on page 58*)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVIII MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1936 No. 3

FREEDOM

A government is an instrument of service only in so far as it is based upon the will and the consent of the people. It is an instrument of oppression when it enforces submission at the point of the bayonet.

Every nation and every individual has the right, and it is their duty, to rise against an intolerable wrong. The people who do not fight for their rights are like slaves. . . Till we are fully free, we are slaves. —Gandhi.

GREETING TO GANDHI!

In a world beset with such horrors in the present and such menaces for the future as defy all adequate description, the attention of millions turned silently but irresistibly a few weeks ago to far-away India, to get news of a little man who was ill of fever. Daily the despatches came, telling of temperatures rising to 105 degrees and of growing weakness in the patient. These despatches occupied only an inch or two of space, hidden by enormous headlines about Germany, Spain, Japan, China, and our own presidential election here in America, but to myriads of persons they seemed to cover the only event of real importance at that moment in the world. In due time came the reassuring word that Gandhi was well again. As so many times before, the Mahatma's frail flesh had conquered disease and returned to health. Gandhi is his own triumphant demonstration of the worth of his dietary and other rules of life, and of the fundamental spiritual truth of the mind's ascendancy over the body! We may therefore believe that Gandhi's birthday this month will find him as vigorous as ever, and as hard at work for India and her people. In the glad and grateful remembrance of this day UNITY would join, and across the wide seas that flow between East and West send greetings to the great leader of a great and heroic nation. The scene has changed in India in recent years, but only in outward appearance. The stupendous work of emancipation goes on, as a mighty people fit themselves, slowly but surely, for a freedom destined to be won not by force of arms but by inner force of character. There is no surrender in India, no acquiescence. A new constitution imposed by masters upon slaves can establish no contentment. Deep down in the hearts of men—at the "grass-roots," as we call it in this country—the Mahatma and his followers are busy, sowing the seeds of that new life which shall some day flower into beauty. These are Gandhi's greatest hours, as they are India's surest promise of redemption.

DR. AMBEDKAR AND THE UNTOUCHABLES

It is an amazing thing that Dr. Ambedkar, the Untouchable leader, is trying to do with the depressed classes of his countrymen. (See article in this issue in "The Field.") Months ago he declared war on Hinduism, and promised to lead his people out of their traditional religion into another faith. This was on the surface a proposal for a wholesale spiritual migration. If successful, it would mark the largest single act of conversion in religious history. Even Charlemagne's conversion of the Saxons to Christianity, at the point of his bloody sword, could not match it. There was religious excitement in India. Moslem and Sikh leaders came to Dr. Ambedkar and presented not only the spiritual claims of their respective faiths, but the practical promises of what they would do for the Untouchables, socially and politically. It was apparently much like the party leaders of America bidding for the votes of the electorate in a presidential campaign! Even the Christians joined in. Missionaries interviewed the great leader, and sent excited reports home about his proposals and the money that might be used to meet his price. But now, as facts become clear, it is evident that this is not a religious movement at all, but a strictly political one. Ambedkar is a politician, not a prophet. Under the new constitution the depressed classes could gain communal representation in the provincial legislatures, if they could gain the right kind of communal status. This might be possible in Islam, but joining Islam would denationalize the Untouchables, and surrender them to Moslem domination. If they became Christians, they would help only to strengthen the hold of Britain on the country, for, says Ambedkar significantly, "Chris-

tianity has government behind it." But if they became Sikhs, they would still be within the charmed circle of Hindu culture, and at the same time gain enormous political advantage. So Ambedkar is calling upon 60,000,000 Untouchables to renounce their Hindu faith and become Sikhs! We hesitate at this distance to pass judgment, but we must confess that it impresses us as sordid business. Buying votes with money is bad enough, but buying them with souls is worse.

MR. LANDON AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

The disposition of the Rooseveltians to ridicule or condemn everything that Mr. Landon says and does is perhaps an inevitable aspect of the campaign. It's the business of partisans to discredit an opponent at any price. But it is disappointing, to say the least, to find so-called non-partisans and independents taking this same thick-and-thin attitude toward a candidate whom they have a right to dislike and to whom, for that very reason, they have a duty to be fair. But they are *not* fair! On the contrary, these so-called liberals—the *Nation* and the *New Republic* for example—are as blindly bitter against Mr. Landon as any picayune Democratic ward-heeler interested only in keeping his office for another four years. As an instance of what we mean, take the Republican candidate's two recent utterances on the subject of civil liberties—one in his Chatauqua speech, when he came out against the teachers oath laws, and the other in his American Legion speech, when he denounced intolerance and bigotry. In neither case was it necessary for Mr. Landon to speak out in this way, or indeed to refer to the subject at all. He might have resorted to the harmless platitudes which we are told are his only stock in trade. But he chose to say his say on this matter more vital to the preservation of our democracy than any other one thing. In these two speeches Mr. Landon did more for the cause of civil liberties in America than President Roosevelt has done in all his years in public office. Yet our so-called non-partisans, with a single voice, pooh-poohed and tah-tahed, minimizing to a point of disreputable ridicule one of the few wholly heartening things which have happened in a peculiarly dull and dismal campaign. The truth is, of course, that Mr. Landon in these utterances took our liberal independents completely by surprise, and they stuttered like half-witted schoolboys. UNITY, as it happens, believes in civil liberties with all its heart and soul. It is truly independent in the sense that it has no connection with any party, and truly liberal in the sense that it stands ready to hail any good in any man or party anywhere. So UNITY acclaims Mr. Landon for his defense of our American liberties.

THE NEWSPAPERS AND THE CAMPAIGN

The announcement of Walter Lippmann, in his far-flung and influential syndicated newspaper column, that he proposes to vote for Landon, and the announcement in the same week of the Baltimore *Sun* that it will not support Roosevelt combine to emphasize the overwhelming preponderance of newspaper sentiment on the Republican side in this campaign. Walter Lippmann began his career as a Socialist, became famous as a Progressive on the *New Republic*, served as a Democrat on the now defunct New York *World*, and now blossoms forth as a Republican. This is a steady drift through the years from left to right. But Lippmann is only one of a large chorus of special newspaper men who are lined up for Landon. Mark Sullivan, Frank Kent, William Hard, David Lawrence, Arthur Brisbane, all support the Republican ticket; and against them we can think of only one man, Arthur Krock, of the New York *Times*. The Baltimore *Sun*, a Democratic paper, is the nearest counterpart in this country to the Manchester *Guardian* in England. Its repudiation of Roosevelt joins it to the massed array of American newspapers, broken only by such a chain as the Scripps-Howard press, and a few such independent journals as the New York *Times* and *Post*. Southern papers, of course, hardly count! The significance of this line-up against the President baffles us. Does it mean that the fourth estate is bound hand and limb to the chariot of Wall Street? Or does it represent, as in the case of the *Sun*, a reaction of tried intelligence and independent spirit upon grave political issues? As regards influence upon the voters, we are again uncertain, for it has been shown again and again in the past that editorial appeal is negligible. We doubt if newspaper opinion, signed or unsigned, conservative or radical, determines one per cent of the ballots. Public sentiment in this country is overwhelmingly a product of feeling and not of thought. It would be interesting to have some Ph.D. researcher take this body of newspaper opinion, match it up with election results and see what it means.

"GOD-CONTROLLED FASCISM"

An interview given last month by Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, leader of the Oxford Group Movement, to the New York *World-Telegram*, and commented upon by *Zion's Herald*, the *Christian Century*, and the *Christian Leader*, confirms all that we have ever thought of this alleged religious apostle. Buchman's work, in its more innocent aspects, is nothing but a high-toned and "snooty" revival of traditional revivalism, and in its essential aspects is an impudent and shameless betrayal of the original Chris-

tianity which it pretends to propagate. Buchman, the man, is pretentious, arrogant, and shallow-minded. All this is proved anew, it seems to us, by the interview just referred to, in which Buchman pays his devout tribute to Adolf Hitler. "I thank heaven for a man like Adolf Hitler, who built a front-line defense against the anti-Christ of Communism." Putting Christ and Hitler together in the same sentence is something of an achievement —like that of the patriotic propagandists in the World War who used to put Christ with helmet, rifle, and bomb in the trenches! We wonder how many of Buchman's fellow-Christians in Germany would join in his "thank heaven" for "Der Fuehrer"! Of course Buchman wishes that Hitler were "surrendered to the control of God." He wants him to be an Oxford Grouper, we suppose! "Or Mussolini. Or any dictator. Through such a man God could control a nation overnight and solve every last, bewildering problem. The world needs the dictatorship of the spirit of God . . . a God-controlled Fascist dictatorship." All this shows the muddle of Dr. Buchman's so-called mind, and the obtuseness of his spirit which has from the beginning failed utterly to comprehend the social significance of Christianity. A "God-controlled Fascism" is a contradiction in terms—like a "God-controlled hell," to quote *Zion's Herald*. If Hitler "surrendered to God," he would have to surrender at that instant the leadership of a party which has denied God and destroyed his Kingdom. As for a "dictatorship of the spirit of God," there is no such thing and should be no such thing. God is a father, not a dictator, and the spirit of the Lord is free. In justice to Dr. Buchman it should be added that he does not approve of Hitler one hundred per cent. "I don't condone everything that the Nazis have done," he says. "Anti-Semitism? Bad, naturally."—How nice!

HARVARD'S TERCENTENARY CELEBRATION

What impresses us about the Harvard anniversary, beyond the glory of a university which holds undisputed through three hundred years the position of primacy in American education, is the method of this anniversary's celebration. If we would know why Harvard is first among all institutions of higher learning in this land, we cannot do better than contemplate what was done in Cambridge this last month. Pageants, parades, meetings of jubilation, flags and festal adornments—O yes, these commonplaces of celebration were of course in place. But this place was background, or atmosphere, for what was really important as an expression of the University's ideals. First in a unique program of observance stands the great assembly, or congress, of the world's greatest scholars. More than seventy of these savants were gathered from all countries as Harvard's guests, and asked to contribute to a survey of the knowledge of mankind to date. The result was a series of papers, delivered through a period of two weeks and later to be published in permanent form, which constitutes the greatest contribution to learning in our time. Next, Harvard has raised a tercentenary fund to be used not for buildings or material display of any kind, but for brains. The first purpose of the fund is to add to the faculty scholars and teachers of outstanding creative ability who will be released, so to speak, to further the cause of learning under Harvard's auspices. The second purpose is to gather students of preeminent promise from all parts of the country to be quickened and led by these great men. If anything can insure Harvard's primacy through another three hundred years, it would seem to be this fund. Lastly, the centenary occasion has been signalized by the publication of a history of the University which promises to take rank among the great historical works of modern times. Written not by a routine hack but by one of the internationally famous members of Harvard's faculty, Professor Samuel Eliot Morison, these volumes add lustre to an already glorious event. Thus, worthy of herself, Fair Harvard enters upon another century!

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE, LOVED AND LOST

UNITY'S losses this year are severe—the two revered veterans, Jabez T. Sunderland and James H. West, and now our contemporary and beloved comrade, EDMUND B. CHAFFEE, one of the freest, bravest, and most gallant of all American clergymen. Technically Dr. Chaffee was a Presbyterian, and editor of the *Presbyterian Tribune*, but this sectarian affiliation, while recognized and honored, never hampered or confined him, and in his public labors never labelled him. His distinction in life, and now his chief memorial after death, was his ministry at the famous Labor Temple in New York City. Here, as successor to Charles Stelzle and Jonathan B. Day, he preached and practised Christianity as a religion for the workers, and used the church heroically as an everyday laboratory for the investigation of industrial, economic, and social problems. A radical to the innermost core of his being, undaunted by slanderous charges of "Communist" and "Red," Dr. Chaffee clung steadfastly to a thorough-going spiritual interpretation of life and commended to all men the Gospel of Christ. There were memorable moments in his career. First and foremost, at the very outset of his ministry, was his refusal to support the war in 1917, and his consequent loss of his pulpit. One of the dozen or more forlorn

Christian clergymen of the country who spurned militarism, fighting of any kind for any cause, as fundamentally inconsistent with Christianity, Dr. Chaffee remained to the end one of the most uncompromising of pacifists. A firm supporter of labor, he opposed all violence. Another was the night of the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti when he stood in the pulpit of the Community Church and prayed for the deliverance of these martyrs. Still another was that day when he challenged the New York Presbytery to sustain the cause of justice in the case of Haywood Patterson and the Scottsboro boys. His last conscious moment was on the platform of the Minnesota Conference of Social Work, where he dropped dead as he was about to begin an address. Dr. Chaffee was courageous in every drop of his blood, idealistic in every fibre of his being. He fought hard and at great personal sacrifice on every far-flung front of progress, yet was always tolerant, gentle, sweet-tempered. He was the most affectionate of friends, the most loyal of comrades. No words can adequately express our sense of loss in the passing of this man.

Mahatma Gandhi's Views on Education

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR*

All too often has the world heard of Mahatma Gandhi as saint or statesman. A modern Isaiah, he is presented to us as a prophet calling upon his people—and the people of the world—to tread the path of righteousness. We have had pictures of the holy man, scantily dressed, moving up and down the plains of Hindustan preaching the gospel of simplicity and dedication, plying the symbolic spinning wheel, releasing from age-old bondage the outcaste and the oppressed. Then, too, there is conjured up before our mind's eye the vision of this guileless saint matching his wits with the British statesmen at the Round Table Conference in London. The Mahatma, as the world is rightly led to believe, has no truck with equivocation which to him is a species of violence; and yet his straightforward, non-violent technique has confounded the most astute British diplomatists. In other words, we have always thought of Gandhi as a holy saint who in a marvelous manner combines the qualities of a rare statesman.

That Gandhi is a specialist in child psychology and in education is not duly appreciated by the world. Had he been born in a free country, Gandhi would have most probably devoted his entire energies to the amelioration of the under-privileged and to the education of the people. I shall cite but three instances to illustrate Gandhi's excellence as a child psychologist and educationist.

In London at Kingsley Hall there was held a powwow between Gandhi and the children of the neighborhood. His technique was simple and effective. He told the English children about "Hindese"[1] (*i.e.*, Indian) children. He spoke of the common interests that children all over the world have, to wit, learning, playing and having a good time. The conversation led to possibilities of quarrels among playmates. Gandhi asked, "How many of you hit the opponent when you felt your rights were denied or you were called names?" One boy triumphantly raised his hand. The others were meekly expectant. Gandhi patted the boy on the back and said, "Bravo! I see you are an honest boy." Continuing, he said: "You should stand up for your rights, but you can convince your opponent much better by arguing with him, by reasoning with him, by showing him the wrong he has done. The way of love is better than the way of fighting." The sweetness that permeated the room as Gandhi and the children were talking was beyond compare. To the children of the East End of London he is not a Mahatma, nor an arch-rebel against England, but Uncle Gandhi.

The meeting between Madame Montessori and Gandhi in England brought two lovers of children face to face. Mme. Montessori spoke no English, but her Latin ardor and facial expressions were more eloquent than the translations by her secretary. At the reception given him by the Montessori Training School, Mme. Montessori went into rhapsodies over the great soul of Gandhi. Said she:

> The Soul of Gandhi, the great Soul of which we are so conscious, is here with us incarnate in his bodily form. The voice we shall soon have the privilege of hearing is that voice which sounds throughout the world. He speaks, and not merely with his voice does he speak but with his whole life. Such a rare thing is this that when it happens every ear listens. Noble Master! I am proud that the voice which is privileged to welcome you here should be the voice of one of the Latin races—a voice from Rome, the great city of Rome, the cradle of the religious thoughts of the West. . . . Thought of the world civilization and thought of the child—that is what links us and brings us together in your presence, O Master! . . .

The Mahatma's reply contains some neat observations on child psychology. "The children," said Gandhi, "have perhaps a finer sense of honor than you and I have. The greatest lessons in life, if we would but stoop and humble ourselves, we would learn not from grown-up learned men but from the so-called ignorant children."

Here is his response to Mme. Montessori's address:

> Madame, you have overwhelmed me with your words. It is perfectly true, I must admit in all humility, that, however indifferently it may be, I endeavor to represent Love in every fiber of my being. I am impatient to realize the presence of my Maker who to me embodies Truth, and in the early part of my career I discovered that if I was to realize the Truth I must obey, even at the cost of my life, the Law of Love. And having been blessed with children, I discovered that the Law of Love could best be understood and learned through little children. Were it not for us, their ignorant poor parents, our children would be perfectly innocent. I believe implicitly that the child is not born mischievous in the bad sense of the term. If parents behave themselves while the child is growing,

*This article is reproduced from Dr. Muzumdar's forthcoming book dealing with education.—Editors.

1. The author has coined the word "Hindese" to obviate the confusion in the American mind between the people of India and the American Indian. It is derived from Hind, the indigenous word for India, and may be used, like Chinese or Japanese, both as an adjective and as a noun.

the child will instinctively obey the Law of Truth and the Law of Love. . . .

As I was watching those beautiful rhythmic movements of the children, my whole heart went out to the millions of children of the semi-starved villages of India. . . .

Believe me, from my experience of hundreds—I was going to say thousands—of children, I know that they have perhaps a finer sense of honor than you and I have. The greatest lessons in life, if we would but stoop and humble ourselves, we would learn not from grown-up learned men but from the so-called ignorant children. Jesus never uttered a loftier or a grander truth than when he said that "wisdom cometh out of the mouths of babes." I believe it. I have noticed in my own experience that if we approached babes in humility and in innocence we would learn wisdom from them. . . .

Recently the Mahatma made an important statement regarding the technique of educating children. In the present anti-untouchability campaign attention is being focused upon the education of the children of Harijans (*i.e.,* God's children, the new name given by Gandhi to the untouchables) and upon adult education among Harijans. Warning against slavish imitation of the modes and methods of present-day schools, Gandhi says:

We have to recognize that we get Harijan children with great difficulty to attend any school at all. We cannot expect any degree of regularity in them and, thanks to our past criminal neglect, they are so unkempt that we have, in the beginning stages, to handle them in a manner wholly different from the ordinary.

Then the Mahatma goes on to enunciate certain fundamental principles of elementary teaching. They are so profound and so well put that I reproduce the statement verbatim:

On first admission their (the children's) bodies have to be minutely examined and thoroughly cleaned. Their clothes might have to be cleaned and patched. The first daily lesson, therefore, will for some time consist of applied hygiene and sanitation and simple needle-work.

I should use no books probably for the whole of the first year. I should talk to them about things with which they are familiar and, doing so, correct their pronunciation and grammar and teach them new words. I should note all the new words they may learn from day to day so as to enable me to use them frequently till they have them fixed in their minds regularly.

The teacher will not give discourses but adopt the conversational method. Through conversations he will give his pupils progressive instruction in history, geography and arithmetic. History will begin with that of our own times, and then, too, of events and of persons nearest us, and geography will begin with that of the neighborhood of the school. Arithmetic will begin with the sums applicable to the pupils' homes. Having tried the method myself, I know that infinitely more knowledge can be given to the pupils through it, and without strain on them, than can be given through the orthodox method, within a given time.

Knowledge of the alphabet should be treated as a separate subject altogether. The letters should be treated as pictures which the children will first be taught to recognize and name. Writing will follow as part of the drawing lesson. Instead of making daubs of their letters, pupils should be able to make perfect copies of the models placed before them. They would not, therefore, be called upon to draw the letters till they had acquired control over their fingers and the pen.

It is criminal to stunt the mental growth of a child by letting him know only as much as he can get through a book which he can incoherently read in a year. We do not realize that if a child was cut off from the home life and was merely doomed to the school, he would be a perfect dunce for several years. He picks up information and language unconsciously through his home, not in the school-room. Hence do we experience the immense difference between pupils belonging to cultured homes and those belonging to uncouth homes, which are no homes in reality.

In the scheme I have adumbrated, the schoolmaster is expected to treat his occupation seriously and feel one with his pupils. I know that, in putting the scheme into operation, the want of schoolmasters of the right type is the greatest difficulty. But we shall not get the right type till we have made the right beginning.

I must postpone the consideration of the stage when we have to arm the pupils with books.

The principles enunciated by Gandhi are in conformity with the most advanced pedagogy of America and Soviet Russia—physical examination, story-telling, the conversational method, the visual method of instruction, education rooted in social experience and flowing back into social experience more enriched and vitalized.

It is fitting poetic justice that the children of the underprivileged in India should be today the recipients of education based upon the most up-to-date pedagogical principles. The above statement on pedagogy alone is sufficient to entitle Gandhi to be considered the father of modern education in India. The world may profitably study Gandhi's pedagogy and watch the results of its application in contemporary India.

Mahatma Gandhi's views on methods of teaching are in conformity with the most advanced pedagogy of the Western world, but the end of education as visualized by him is in consonance with the ideals of "our ancient (Hindu) school system."[2] Considering occidental civilization as "materialistic" and as a "nine days' wonder," Gandhi does not put much stock in the ideals of education propagated by the "victims" of that civilization. Taking his cue from Edward Carpenter, the Mahatma regards Western civilization as a "disease," whose chief symptom is irreligion.

"Civilization," according to Mahatma Gandhi, "is that mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty. Performance of duty and observance of morality are convertible terms. To observe morality is to attain mastery over our mind and our passions. So doing, we know ourselves. The Gujarati equivalent for civilization is 'good conduct'."

"Mastery over our mind and our passions"—yes, self-discipline, self-rule, Swaraj—that must be the end-product of true civilization, and the ideal of education. Instead of promoting self-discipline, modern civilization prompts its votaries to learn ever newer and more efficient ways of circumventing the restraints imposed by nature and society. Instead of holding up good health as the immediate as well as the ultimate ideal, modern civilization concentrates upon healing sickness by multiplying hospitals.

A multiplicity of hospitals [says the Mahatma] is no test of civilization. It is rather a symptom of decay even as a multiplicity of *Pinjrapoles* (hospitals for cattle) is a symptom of the indifference to the welfare of the cattle by the people in whose midst they are brought into being. Let us be concerned chiefly with the prevention of diseases rather than with their cure. The science of sanitation is infinitely more ennobling, though more difficult of execution, than the science of healing. I regard the present system (of medicine) as black magic, because it tempts people to put an undue importance on the body and practically ignores the spirit within. Investigate the laws concerning the health of the spirit and you will find that they will yield startling results even with reference to the cure of the body. The present science of medicine is divorced from religion. A man who attends to his daily *Namaz* or his *Gayatri* in the proper spirit need never fall ill. A clean spirit must build a clean body. [*Namaz* and *Gayatri* are Mohammedan and Hindu forms of worship and prayer respectively; both require certain postures and intense concentration of mind.]

Not only does modern civilization put a premium upon the multiplication of meliorative agencies such as hospitals but it also preaches the gospel of

2. Mahatma M. K. Gandhi: *Sermon on the Sea,* edited by Haridas T. Muzumdar. Chicago [since 1930, New York]: Universal Publishing Co., 1924.

the good life in terms of a multiplicity of material goods. The more wants you have and the more goods you possess, the more civilized you are supposed to be. Such is the nature of occidental civilization.

The business of the machinery of formal education the world over is to propagate the values inherent in the particular culture. By the very logic of the situation, therefore, Western education cannot help teaching the cult of more wants, material prosperity, greed, bodily ease, circumvention of the laws if you can get by with it.

Referring specifically to "primary" and "higher" education, Mahatma Gandhi says:

> What is the meaning of education? If it simply means a knowledge of letters, it is merely an instrument; and an instrument may be well used or abused. The same instrument that may be used to cure a patient may be used to take his life, and so may a knowledge of letters. [That is to say, if a knowledge of letters were imparted without reference to the entelechy, to the implicit destiny, of man.] We daily observe that many men abuse it (i. e., their knowledge of letters) and very few make good use of it. . . .
>
> The ordinary meaning of education is a knowledge of letters. To teach boys reading, writing and arithmetic is called primary education. A peasant earns his bread honestly. He has ordinary knowledge of the world. He knows fairly well how he should behave toward his parents, his wife, his children and his fellow-villagers. He understands and observes the rules of morality. But he cannot write his name.

Is such a farmer, asks Gandhi in effect, to be considered uneducated? It is his contention that the illiterate peasant may be truly said to have had "primary" education because he duly fulfills his functions as a member of society.

> Now let us take higher education [continues Gandhi]. I have learned geography, astronomy, algebra, geometry, etc. What of that? In what way have I benefited myself or those around me? Why have I learned these things? Professor Huxley has thus defined education: "That man I think has had a liberal education who has been so trained in youth that his body is the ready servant of his will and does with ease and pleasure all the work that as a mechanism it is capable of; whose intellect is a clear, cold logic engine with all its parts of equal strength and in smooth working order; . . . whose mind is stored with a knowledge of the fundamental truths of nature; . . . whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the ready servant of a tender conscience; . . . who has learned to hate all vileness and to respect others as himself. Such an one and no other, I conceive, has had a liberal education, for he is in harmony with nature. He will make the best of her and she of him."
>
> If this be true education, I must emphatically say that the sciences enumerated above I have never been able to use for controlling my senses. Therefore, whether you take elementary education or higher education, it is not required for the main thing. It does not make of us men. It does not enable us to do our duty.

What is "the main thing" that man must strive for, that civilization should uphold, that education should foster? The answer is: "Character-building," which used to have "the first place in our ancient school system." Yes, "character-building"—"that is primary education. A building erected on that foundation will last."

Character-building means "making of us men"; the "enabling us to do our duty"; "mastery over our mind and our passions." He who is master of himself is master of the universe. The Occident has made a fetish of freedom without fully understanding the meaning of freedom. Freedom does not consist in unlimited, aimless indulgence of one's whims and desires. If every motorist insisted on driving his car on the road wherever he pleased—i. e., on the right or the left or the center—there would be no "freedom" for any motorist to travel over the highways of this country with safety. Freedom, in other words, like every proper expression of human behavior, is in terms of a frame of reference, in terms of certain objectives and loyalties.

Freedom, according to Mahatma Gandhi, consists in *the capacity to impose restraints upon oneself.* The great German philosopher Nietzsche, likewise, defined freedom in similar terms. If freedom, thus defined, were held up as an objective before pupils, the problem of discipline would vanish instantaneously. But before this conception of freedom can be held up as a worthy objective by our educators, the dominant ideology of occidental civilization shall have to be changed. Not a multiplication of wants but a renunciation of wants; not self-indulgence but self-denial; not beating the law but imposing restraints from within in conformity with the objective reality—not until these ideals become woven into the fabric of a civilization can its educational machinery preach them—and make them vital in the lives of pupils!

India and World Peace

JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND

The conquest of Ethiopia by Italy, and the consternation which it has caused in England on account of its menace to the Suez Canel and Britain's route to India, may well set the world thinking about the relation which India—India held in subjection by Britain—bears to world peace.

Again and again it has been declared by statesmen in Europe that the real cause of the World War of 1914-1918 was India. The possession by Great Britain, for more than a century and a half, of so vast and rich an empire in Asia as India is, had been all the while kindling jealousy and lust of conquest in the breasts of the other nations of Europe. All the leading nations had looked on with envy, and said: If Great Britain holds her vast and rich Indian possessions as a result of conquest by the sword, why should not we also use the sword and conquer rich and lucrative possessions? If by her navy and army she has won for herself such a splendid "place in the sun," why should not we create armies and navies and win an equal place in the sun?

England has fought more wars during the last two centuries than any other nation, and the larger part of them have been directly or indirectly caused by India.

England's conquest of Egypt in 1882 was primarily to get control of the nation in whose territory lay the Suez Canal, and thus protect her passageway to India.

It has been England's hold on India that has made her regard it necessary not only to obtain possession of the Suez Canal and lands on the route to India, such as Egypt, Cyprus and areas on the Arabian coast and the Persian Gulf, but also to possess and powerfully fortify such strongholds as Gibraltar (conquered from Spain), Malta (which properly be-

longs to Italy), Aden at the entrance to the Red Sea (wrested from Arabia), and that has recently caused her to build her great naval base at Singapore.

England's navy, the existence of which has created so much uneasiness among all other nations and which has been a constant incitement to them to increase their navies, owes its existence mainly to India—to England's felt necessity for keeping open her sea route to her distant possession and for defending that possession against any nation that might want to rob her of it.

Britain's hostility to Germany, which had been growing for fifteen or twenty years before the war of 1914, sprang largely from her fear that Germany's ambition to gain a foothold in Asia might limit her own influence there, and especially might endanger her hold on India. Particularly had she been alarmed over Germany's project of a railway from Berlin to Bagdad, because such a great highway would bring Germany so much nearer to England's great Indian possession.

If twenty or thirty years before the Great War Britain had admitted India to partnership within the British Empire, with home rule, Germany would never have dreamed of her Berlin-to-Bagdad railway project. Thus there would have been no war. This means that if Britain had been wise enough to extend to India, in time, the hand of justice, friendship and brotherhood, as noble Englishmen like John Bright, Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill, Sir Henry Cotton, Sir William Wedderburn, and others urged her to do, instead of being guided by her blind imperialists and militarists, the results today would have been an England leading the world in prosperity and peace, instead of a land mourning the loss of millions of its noblest young men, the widowing of its wives and mothers, the piling up of a crushing debt of billions of pounds, and, what is even more important, the results on the European Continent would have been that of prosperity and peace, instead of, as now, conditions of indescribable fear, hate, misery and indebtedness. Thus England has paid dear, and Europe has paid dear for an India conquered, exploited, and held down by the sword.

It is not only true that India has been the main cause of England's wars for two centuries, but it is also true that India has been a constantly inciting cause, even more so than the Balkans or Turkey (although not always realized), of Europe's political jealousies, ambitions, intrigues, rivalries, and secret diplomacies.

All this that I am saying, and very much more along the same lines, is affirmed by the most trustworthy authorities in England, India, and elsewhere. Let me cite some of their words which are well worth the attention of all persons who care for the peace of the world and the future welfare of all mankind.

Not long before his death Mr. Lajpat Rai, the eminent Indian statesman, said to the writer in a personal letter: "The problem of India, that is, the problem whether great India is to be free or slave, is not only an important problem to Great Britain, but it is one of the greatest possible concern to the whole world. It is a question upon which, more perhaps than upon any other whatever, the future peace of Asia, Europe, and the whole world depends. In the very nature of the case no League of Nations and no other possible agency or power can ensure peace to the world so long as a great civilized nation, located in the very center of the world's greatest continent and possessing one-fifth of the entire population of the globe, is in bondage. We see, therefore, why the problem of India's freedom or bondage is not only a world problem, but a problem more fundamental to the world's peace and safety than any other whatever."

The truth of these statements has been strongly corroborated by Professor Robert Morss Lovett, of the University of Chicago, in the following plain language: "It is a fact, of which all the nations of the world may well take notice, that the foreign policy of Great Britain has long been determined, is determined today, and in the future must be determined, by her possession of India. This makes her relation to India not a domestic affair but a matter of world-concern. It is not too much to say that this rich treasure upon which she has got her grip in India has caused Great Britain, like the giant Fafner, to turn herself into a dragon, watchful, warlike, ready to rush from her cave, breathing fire, upon any nation she deemed covetous of her possession. Only this must be added that instead of a mere mass of metal, of gold, the treasure in India over which Great Britain stands guard is composed of human beings and human destinies. . . . It is only by the acquiescence, the virtual consent, of the world that Great Britain has been able to maintain herself 'in possession of her Indian Empire', an acquiescence secured by propaganda, intrigue, quid pro quo, alliance, intimidation and war. . . . The freeing of India would go farther than any other conceivable action toward the settling of the imperial control of one nation by the other nations throughout the world. And India would be set free if the world viewed with clear, truthful eyes the monstrous nature of her subjection and its menace to the world's peace."

A Hindu Prayer

Awake, O God!
O God, awake!
The world is burning today
In a conflagration of selfishness.
In these days of an infernal cataclysm,
Should You, my Lord,
Keep on sleeping soulless
On a lifeless bed of forgetfulness?

Awake, O God!
O God, awake!
Please open Your eyes a little
To look at Your own earth,
And see in what agony of sorrow
Most of Your children
Are being tortured today.
Look, dear Lord,
How men have assumed
The forms of ferocious beasts
And with their fierce claws of greed,
And their ferocious teeth of armaments
Are tearing to shreds
Their brother men
In the ruthless jungle of the world.
And greed-blinded man-beasts
Are fiendishly devouring with relish
The flesh of the bodies
Of their brother men;
And are joyously drinking with pride
The blood of their fellow men—
Why is it, beloved Lord,
That men do not know
Men yet?

Awake, O God!
O God, awake!
Do leave Your
Shameless sleep aside,
And be merciful enough
To create man
As man again.

BASANTA KOOMAR ROY.

Social Practices in India

CURTIS W. REESE

In the latter part of the fifteenth century a man by the name of Columbus set sail in an effort to find a short cut to India. It will be remembered that he stopped short of his goal. Americans, for the most part, have followed the example of their illustrious discoverer and have not yet reached India. This is true both culturally and commercially. We have never understood or appreciated India's spiritual aspirations and comparatively we have little business dealings with her. This is unfortunate for both America and India.

With rare exceptions even the Americans who go to India do not really get there. Usually they go without the slightest understanding of the Indian point of view. While there, their conversation is usually limited to the English whom they meet around the hotels and on the trains or to other Americans like themselves. They see slums very much like the ones they have carefully avoided seeing in America. They are deeply touched by the condition of the "Untouchables," but forget the "grandfather clause" and the "Jim Crow cars" in some of our states. They are horrified over the stories of the riots between Hindus and Mohammedans, but forget the race riots in Chicago and East St. Louis, and our lynchings which for savagery are unsurpassed anywhere in the world. They photograph everything from dobe huts to the Taj Mahal, but fail to sense the soul of the people. When Americans travel abroad they need a sense of history and a good memory for current events.

Of the social practices in India the ones of most obvious interest are caste, the position of woman, disposal of the dead, and the sacred position of the cow.

Caste is at once the most powerful thing in Hindu life and the greatest hindrance to national progress. While eating and marriage are the two things most hard hit by the caste system, it is also true that in a thousand ways the system makes difficult the national unity which is necessary for India's independence. I do not want to smooth over in the least the damning quality of the caste system. It is spiritually and socially vile. And, while some students of Indian life find in caste the stabilizing factor that makes Indian civilization possible, the reformers of India are themselves waging war on the system; and its fall may not be so far removed as is commonly thought.

Caste, however, is not what it is sometimes thought to be, namely a division of the people into four great groups—priests, warriors, tradesmen and tillers of the soil, and the servant class. On the contrary there are about three thousand castes. Even the outcastes are themselves subdivided into outcaste castes. Originating perhaps on a color basis, caste has long since grown away from so simple a beginning and has divided and subdivided along functional and other lines. Even groups that originated in opposition to caste have themselves become castes. The Brahmins were shrewd enough to make themselves secure at the top of the system. Originally the Brahmins were the priestly class; but now they engage in other pursuits also. They enjoy all sorts of special privileges and immunities, and naturally will oppose bitterly any effort to restrict what they regard as their inherent rights.

Worse yet, outside the caste system are the fifty or sixty million untouchables whose very shadow is regarded in some parts of the country as pollution. One of the most significant features of Gandhi's work is his plea for the removal of untouchability, but strange enough he has not been especially hostile in his attitude towards the caste system as such.[1] It should be remembered, however, that the essential features of caste, namely color prejudice, racial bigotry, and class consciousness are quite at home in the Western world. In America the Nordic myth recently had great vogue and the Ku Klux Klan attempted to invade the state and national capitals and to control national political conventions. And in England "knowing one's betters" is regarded as a social if not a spiritual virtue.

The position of woman in India is a point of severe attack on the Indian social life, and without doubt this is a vulnerable point. But usually the attackers forget that the movement for the emancipation of woman is a rather recent thing in the West. I myself remember distinctly speaking thirteen times in a campaign to persuade my reluctant fellow citizens to grant the ballot to women. It is claimed by some that the ancient status of women in India was superior to that of women in the modern Western world until quite recently. Lajpat Rai maintains[2] that in India's vedic age the position of woman was an exalted one and that her position as wife was not one of subservience; that in the epic age the position of woman remained high save for a tendency on the part of some of the higher class to seclude their wives; and that the present position of woman is the result of a gradual decline from an original high status, whereas in the West the present position of woman has resulted from an improvement which began with a somewhat lower status. Moreover, it should be remembered that in the period during which the West has been improving the status of woman, India has been in a state of servitude, which is not conducive to social progress. I stress this point. It is hardly fair to put people in a position where improvement is practically impossible and then condemn them for not making progress.

Too much could hardly be said in condemnation of the practice of early marriage. But it is only fair to say that a strong movement for reform in this matter is well under way, led by native reformers and supported by the liberal journals of the land; and that this movement has resulted in raising the marriageable age of girls to fourteen and of boys to eighteen, effective April 1, 1930. Moreover, it should be remembered that the general, I do not say universal, practice has been to regard early marriage as the equivalent of betrothal in the West and not to be consummated till a later age, the bride meanwhile remaining with her parents. In the United States several commonwealths still regard the age of twelve as suitable for legal marriage; and in England not until June of 1929 was the legal age of marriage raised from twelve for females and fourteen for males to sixteen for both. The West should be guarded in its expressions of self-righteousness.

Another Hindu practice which is much discussed in the West is the disposal of the dead. The burning

1. *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas.* By C. F. Andrews.
2. *Unhappy India.* By Lajpat Rai.

ghats are points of major interest to the tourists and while the present crude manner of burning bodies in the open is rather revolting to persons unaccustomed to such rites certainly the practice of cremation is itself fundamentally sound and sanitary. A more modern, less public, and somewhat more rapid mode of cremation will no doubt be developed if and when India's economic situation improves. Improvement in even the most inexpensive matters is difficult for a country where the average daily income probably does not exceed ten cents and where millions live on only a bowl of rice per person a day.

But perhaps the most spectacular social practice is that of veneration for the cow. The sacred position of the cow is the most difficult Hindu practice for a Western mind to comprehend. I for one can see no reasonable ground to support such a dogma, despite the theory that the doctrine grew up to save India from being left without agricultural animals, bullocks being used in India much as we use horses. Whatever may have been the reason for this doctrine, Indian reformers, including Gandhi, will do well to give more attention to its eradication. The doctrine is not a part of their ancient culture but has grown up within the last two thousand years.

Without dwelling longer on the social practices, I should like to suggest that a realistic catalogue of the social doings of any country East or West would make reading not altogether suitable to go through the mails. Anyway, India's need for social reform is an argument for her freedom, for freedom is prerequisite to all worthwhile ends.

When You Go to India

ALSON H. ROBINSON

Seasoned observers of the Indian scene will be mildly amused by my presumption in giving advice on what to do when you go to India. Had some of my friends who have crossed the boundary of that struggling and mysterious land not been quite so modest in reply to inquiries, my difficulties would have been fewer. One does not have to know everything in order to be helpful. So here is a brief and modest effort—a sort of boy scout good deed on behalf of prospective travelers to India.

First, it is a good plan to realize that you are going a long way from home; assuming, that is, that you live in the United States. In a passage attributed to Buddha and therefore regarded as scripture by millions of his followers, he says: "Long is the night to him who is awake; long is a mile to him who is tired; long is life to the foolish who do not know the true law." In terms of distance, far away is India both in time and space to him who has no pity for his fellow man. Of course the time that it takes to get there is not so long as it was when Columbus and Magellan made their dramatic efforts with results so surprising both to themselves and to subsequent generations. It used to take months to get there. The actual distance has not changed, but I figured it out the other day that if one were to take the *Hindenburg* at Lakewood, N. J., and connect with one of the fast Dutch Planes in Berlin, in just a little less than seven days after he had taken to the air he would find himself settling upon the Lord Willingdon landing field in Delhi, with everybody along the way taking it as a matter of course.

But if such a traveler is still capable of reminding himself that he has arrived in a land whose culture and whose literature run back, let us say, to a period thousands of years before the Christian era; if he will bear in mind that in the intervening centuries kingdoms have risen and passed away; that the followers of Mohammed have found here some of their greatest conquests; that British Interests have enjoyed undisputed authority for a period of 175 years, such observations may impress the visitor with the desirability of remembering that India is a long way off and that anything may happen on his trip.

Second, when you go to India, it is a good plan to try to form some picture of what it will look like after you get there. It will not look that way, of course, but that's all the more fun. There are some scenes, however, which are not difficult to visualize, and which tell a lot. For instance, as your ship moves leisurely up the Hooghly River on the way to Calcutta, you will see great areas of mud huts where the peasants and workers live, squalid beyond imagination except to those who are familiar with housing conditions in some of the rural areas of our own South. Then presently at a turn in the river you come suddenly upon a great mass of factory buildings, vast, impressive, modern, which prove to be the famous jute mills of Calcutta. Here is your first and most eloquent symbol of British industrialism in India. From the appearance of the huts, in contrast with the magnificence of the mills, it is obvious that the owners do not live there; and when you pick up a Calcutta paper the shock of reading that there is a very bad strike among the jute workers for a living wage will not be quite so severe.

You ought to be prepared, if you enter India through this particular port, to find yourself in one of the dirtiest and most disease-ridden cities in the world. During the single week that we were in Calcutta, there were over five hundred deaths from smallpox, and cholera was epidemic. Of course that is only part of the picture, since, in this great city—second largest in the British Empire—you will find schools, hospitals, universities, temples for religious worship, common symbols of what we regard as instruments of civilization and human justice.

Go to Benares by all means, in spite of the fact that you may meet some Englishman who will advise against it because "it's so dirty." But Benares is the most sacred city in India, and you have to take a chance. The traditional attraction for the tourist is to go to the Ganges at dawn and see the pilgrims as they come from far and near to bathe in the holy river. I went with as sympathetic and reverent an attitude as possible, but I must confess that it is something of an act of supererogation; which, however, one will neglect to his everlasting disappointment. When one realizes that the sewage of many of the great cities of India pours its poison into this stream of water, and when he sees the bodies of human beings in the ritual of burial cast into the very water where countless persons are bathing, he wonders if this Ganges worship is not

quite as much an exercise in physiological resistance as it is an act of purification. Such would certainly be the case for a Westerner.

Happily the resources for a study of the Hindu tradition are almost limitless in Benares. You will certainly want to go to Sarnath, where Buddha preached his first sermon. Here is the ancient stupa, a modern temple in which a famous Japanese artist is reproducing lovely scenes from the life of Buddha, Asoka's pillar, and the rules for obeying the master. And you ought to keep in mind when you are in Benares that you owe something to the memory of Mrs. Annie Besant who did so much to interpret the Hindu faith to Westerners. You ought to pay your respect to the scene of her labors.

Of course you are bound not to miss Agra, location of the Taj Mahal, one of the most exquisite creations of human genius. Built in 1630 by Shah Jahan, the great Mohammedan Emperor, as a memorial to his wife, no description of its distinctly religious atmosphere and all-pervading melancholy has ever been adequate. I expected to find at least a semi-ruined structure. For the splendid condition of its repair, and the almost adequate landscaping which serves as a setting, we will hardly criticize the expenditure of vast sums of money by Lord Cecil and acquired by him through his romantic connection with the Leiter millions of Chicago.

On your way to Delhi, capital of this vast and ancient country, it will be well to ask yourself which Delhi you propose to visit, since there have been eight of them. As a matter of fact but two of them remain. The old Delhi of Shah Jahan, and the new Delhi of the British Viceroy. Of the latter, if you are well advised, you will want to know a lot, possibly more than they care to tell. These glimpses are designed to stimulate you to form some picture of what you are likely to see. If your time is limited, pick out a few places and see them as thoroughly as possible. Go at the proper season of the year, January or February, and respect the weakness of your all-too-feeble Western flesh.

Third, when you go to India make a big point of learning something about the relation between the races and classes of people you will meet. Generally speaking the problem is very simple because you have just two classes to observe: white and colored; British and Indian; dominant and subject. It is just as easy as that. Of course no Britisher would ever concede such simplicity, since the policy of divide and rule is still effective, and so conscious has British rule made them of their normal differences that it is difficult for Indians to realize that there are other matters beside the so-called Communal Award which are vastly more important.

But you will soon find out that so far as the Englishman in India is concerned there is a certain pattern which is easily distinguishable and all but universal. Mark Channing, who has come to be one of the exceptions, makes the confession in his *Indian Mosaic* that he took the usual attitude of Britishers towards Indians as a matter of course. "I accepted the natural courtesy and selflessness of such Indians as I happened to meet," he says, "as being my right. Most Englishmen do. In those days I would no more have thought of playing tennis with an Indian or allowing myself to be seen going about with one than I would have walked into the gymkhana club stark naked. In fact I was a snob of snobs."

Of course there is something vastly more than snobbery in the story of British rule in India. Like so many other tragic and complicated situations when one person dominates another it is possible to draw up in parallel columns the case for and against the existing order. The establishment of law and order, the erection of imposing public buildings, the development of modern systems of transportation and communication—here are some of the familiar items on what is commonly advanced as the credit side. The other side of the picture is symbolized by poverty, ignorance, disease, and repression; unavoidable to the most casual and unobserving traveler. And the confusing part of it is that some of those features which have the outward appearance of blessings turn out to be injuries. The Imperial splendor at the time of the Moghuls became the measure of the people's misery. The Indian people are certainly no happier or healthier under British Rule because of those jute mills outside Calcutta, or the magnificence of the Viceroy's palace in Delhi.

Just now would be a most advantageous time to go to India because there is a great deal of discussion about the new constitution; the British India Act, so called. For a good many years India has been chugging along on a cylinder or two of the old vehicle which has now become completely inoperative. This new act is the result of long, and some of it painful, discussion—the Round Table Conference, for example. In some points it is more liberal than the old arrangement; in others, it may be even worse. There is admittedly no jubilation over the act. In England they ask whether anything so novel can be made to work. In India there is disillusionment because they appear to be right back where they started before all the talk began.

I was fortunate enough to be in India when the National Congress was holding its annual meeting at Lucknow. The Party was divided upon many points; but upon one there was unanimity—complete rejection of the new Constitution. The differences of opinion turn upon the method making this rejection effective: whether Party members shall or shall not accept office under the new constitution. On this point the Congress postponed action. But whatever happens, the new constitution and the new Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, are in for a stormy voyage.

Finally, when you go to India, whatever else you do or do not do, see Mahatma Gandhiji. The foregoing advice about places to visit and situations to observe sinks into insignificance in comparison with this central objective which should be foremost in the heart of every prospective traveler in India. I should go so far as to say that nothing else matters, since when you have seen and talked with Gandhiji you have seen and felt the symbol of all that is vital in India today.

It may not be so easy for you to see him as it was for me. A recent issue of the *Harijan*, a modest publication on behalf of the oppressed classes, announces that the Mahatma has moved to a tiny and inaccessible village in the interior. His heart has always been in the villages, and he now feels that he can serve them effectively only by going to one to live. Thanks to this decision, visitors and others who wish

to see him, now get a compulsory walk of about eleven miles—at this season of the year, through the mud—sometimes plus a sermon on regular walking. He has made it a rule that no one, unless he be completely disabled, should be encouraged to make the journey in a bullock cart. But I was much more fortunate. Gandhi was visiting in Lucknow during the Congress meeting in April, holding himself available for conference with the leaders who constantly turn to him, particularly in such a crisis as that which now faces the country.

Within the limits of his time, and physical endurance—which seems inexhaustible—he will welcome anybody who wishes to see him; but if you wish to have the door thrown wide open, provide yourself, if you can get it, with a letter of introduction from the editor of UNITY. What that letter and others from Mr. Holmes did in India was simply unbelievable. When I mentioned the fact that I had such a communication, the word invariably went out that Dr. Holmes was outside. It was terrific to be compelled to shine in the light of such reflected greatness, and how the poor Indian was let down when he so quickly discovered his mistake!

Gandhiji was staying in a modest little house within a stone's throw of the enormous barracks occupied by the British troops in Lucknow. What a lesson in the very contrast between the outward display of violence on the one hand and of non-resistance on the other! When I was ushered into the tiny room which he and a group of eight or ten of his associates were occupying, somebody followed me with the only chair in sight—concession to the weakness of European or American legs. But when Mr. Gandhi apologized for not rising from the floor, and explained that he had been very busy since early in the morning, I knew at once that the only thing for me to do was to get down on the floor beside him. I must have looked funny. The empty chair certainly did. What we talked about is comparatively inconsequential. There were the altogether appropriate personalities, since I was bringing to him the greeting of his best friend and interpreter in America.

It was Easter Sunday, and Gandhi, realizing the significance of the day for me, was quick to turn the conversation along lines in which I should feel at home, and with which he was sympathetic. It was soon over. I felt that I had no claim on this man's time in the midst of this busy conference. At least a dozen of the most important Party leaders were waiting to see him; in fact they had left the room in order that I might be granted the interview. But as I stepped out from the quietness and confidence of that room into the dust and heat of the streets of Lucknow, I realized that something had happened to me in what I may regard as the crowning experience of my life; at any rate I had achieved what I had come to India to do.

Out of the confusion of the moment certain impressions began to emerge which may perhaps very briefly be summarized as follows: First, I realized that I had come in contact with the most radiant personality whom it had ever been my privilege to meet. Physically commanding or attractive, he is not. Conversation is not entirely easy to carry on, since in common with many educated Indians Gandhi drops his voice on important words and uses what to us is strange inflection on others. But the most appropriate expression of the ecstasy of the moment which I could think of was to send a telegram to my wife and daughter which read as follows: "Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord."

Once again what impressed me most was the religious atmosphere of the place. Only three or four miles away a great political conference was being held in the heat and dust of an Indian summer. Involved in the issue of the Government of India Act were questions of the acceptance of office, the powers of the Viceroy, the Communal Award, the right of untouchables to worship in Hindu temples, the struggle for civil rights both under British rule and that of the Indian Princes.

Presiding over the Congress Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had said that Socialism is the only solution. Perhaps it is. Mahatma Gandhi made a different approach when in substance he said to me, "I have a living faith in a living God even as I have a living faith in many things that scientists tell me. You can realize God if you tread the path which leads to his realization. God is beyond the senses. The divine music is incessantly going on within ourselves, but the loud senses drown the delicate music. Realizing our littleness during this tiny span of life we close every morning prayer with the recitation of a verse which means: Misery so-called is no misery, nor riches so-called riches. Forgetting or denying God is the true misery, remembering or faith in God is true riches." I wonder who is right, Nehru or Gandhi. In any event, when you go to India if you can at least touch the hem of Gandhi's garment, life will take on a sort of immortality which it has not previously possessed.

BOOKS
By
Dr. JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND

August 3, 1936.

Dr. John Haynes Holmes
26 Sydney Place
Brooklyn, N. Y.

My dear Friend:

I guess the end for me is pretty near and I would like to consign, if you are willing, such books as my **India in Bondage,** and the large pamphlet **The Truth About India,** to the Unity Publishing Co., to advertise and to sell, the proceeds to go to **UNITY.**

Is this too much to ask of you? There are not many of the **India in Bondage,** perhaps 15 or 20 copies. There are perhaps 75 or 100 copies of **Truth About India.** The **India in Bondage** should be sold for $2.00. The **Truth About India** for 10 or 20 cents, as you see fit.

The books and pamphlets are here at my son's. If Unity Publishing Co. decides to handle them, my son Edson R. Sunderland will send them to such address as you may direct.

From your friend and brother who has long honored, esteemed, and loved you.

Jabez T. Sunderland.

• • • • •

These books are being forwarded to **UNITY** and may be secured on order at $2.00 for **India in Bondage,** and 10 cents for **Truth About India.**

Address Unity Publishing Co.,
700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago

What Can We Learn From History?

By REGINALD A. REYNOLDS

[Our Special Correspondent in England]

There is a story about an American who was chiding an English friend regarding the latter's ignorance of history. "For example," said the Yankee, "you are almost certainly unaware that in 1814 the British sacked and burnt Washington."

"Burnt *Washington!*" the Englishman exclaimed in genuine surprise; "I knew we burnt Joan of Arc, but that I *can't* believe."

The only point about this story is that there are landmarks in American history which might cause us a little reflection were they not considered too unimportant for inclusion in our own text books. I have no idea how history is taught in Denmark, though I have heard of a party of Danes which expressed surprise and regret on discovering from the local guide books the extensive damage done by their countrymen to our East Coast towns. In France, where I once taught for some months, I remember a similar feeling myself on reading about the Hundred Years' War from an entirely new angle. It had never struck me very forcibly till then that the British exploits under the Plantagenets were not considered in the least bit gallant or praiseworthy by the French. Indeed, the French schoolboys seemed to be reading quite a different account of the affair altogether.

Turning to India I have often noted the fact that few English people can remember any of the history of that country beyond a vague recollection of the Black Hole of Calcutta. This, of course, is doubly distressing when one reflects that the Black Hole itself hangs upon the flimsiest of historical evidence and has even been challenged as a bottomless myth—a rather shadier hole than it appears to be at first sight. How many English people, on the other hand, know the really interesting and significant facts about the early days of "John Company," whose ships in the eighteenth century were commonly built to weigh 499 tons, because all ships of 500 tons and over were compelled by law to carry a Chaplain . . . !

Not for the first time, light comes from the East.

Jawaharlal Nehru is a better known figure than any other in Indian politics—with the one obvious exception.

Nehru is a Socialist—the leader of young India. He is a cosmopolitan, educated in England and widely travelled. But of late he has spent much of his time in Indian jails, as is the custom with the really great men of that country—and one that is likely to last as long as British Rule.

In jail Jawaharlal was by no means idle. He read deeply and wrote charming letters to his daughter, telling her about her country and other countries and the history of people and ideas. And it is of these letters that a remarkable book has been composed—the first History of the World from an Asiatic standpoint, and certainly the fairest and most readable for children.

As for the adults, their best plan is to follow the biblical precept and "become as little children" themselves. Most of them might just as well unlearn any history they ever learned at school, anyway; and then we could start level with our nephews and nieces in remoulding our ideas.

A world history written by a man of action in the enforced quietude of a prison is bound to have unusual qualities, though the feat is not unique. Sir Walter Raleigh also attempted it while awaiting his trial and execution. He probably experienced the same fortunate hindrance—the difficulty of verifying dates and multiplying references.

In his *Glimpses of World History,* Jawaharlal Nehru gets over the problem of dates by accompanying his two volumes with some excellent date charts, compiled after his release, and showing the chronological correlationship between events in various parts of the world. For the rest, the history itself makes easy and pleasant reading and is mercifully free from the pedantry of endless footnotes and appendices.

Combined with a delightful simplicity of style the forceful expression of opinion is the making of this massive work. The Indian leader has no illusions as to the possibility of an "unbiased" approach to history. Every historian has his bias, and the least dangerous is the one who knows it, admits it and does not attempt to conceal it behind a cloak of impartiality. But there is no finality or dogma about the book and the views it puts forward. "Of the faults that these letters contain there is no end," writes the author in his preface, "Even as I was writing the letters my outlook on history changed gradually."

Thus, when we read of the Magna Charta we come across such a comment as this:

> It is interesting to think that this rule laid down in England over seven hundred years ago does not apply to India even in 1932 under British Rule. Today, one individual, the Viceroy, has power to issue Ordinances, framing laws and depriving people of their liberty and their property.

Or again, discussing the fall of the Roman Empire, Nehru gives us some comments and a comparison:

> For over three hundred years Rome was supreme in the West. . . . It is curious that during this long period it did not produce anything great in the realm of thought as Greece did in a short time. Indeed Roman civilization seems to have been in many respects a pale shadow of Hellenic civilization. . . . The British Empire is often compared with the Roman Empire—usually by the English to their own great satisfaction. All empires are more or less similar. They fatten on the exploitation of the many. But there is one strong resemblance between the Romans and the English people—they are both singularly devoid of imagination!

The Indian leader's comments on religion in general and Christianity in particular, I found especially interesting.

> For some people (he tells his daughter) religion means the other world. . . . In the hope of going to heaven they are religious or do certain things. This reminds me of the child who behaves in the hope of being rewarded with a jam puff! . . . What then shall we say of grown-up persons who think and act in this way?

Nehru then discusses the foolishness of dogmatic assertion by religious people who presume "to talk with certainty of such matters and to break each others

heads for them." In the end, he says, "as they talk of things which cannot be seen or proved it is difficult to settle the argument." He tells his daughter, "You will meet very fine and noble people who are religious, and knaves and scoundrels who, under the cloak of religion, rob and defraud others. And you will have to think about these matters and decide for yourself."

Jesus, Nehru points out, was not put to death for his religious opinions. The Romans were not intolerant in religious matters. Tiberius had said "If the Gods are insulted, let them see to it themselves," so Pilate could not have been worried by that aspect of the matter.

> Jesus was looked upon as a political, and by the Jews as a social, rebel; and as such he was tried and sentenced. . . . But it is strange to think of the rebel Jesus preaching non-violence and *ahimsa* (harmlessness) and a revolt against the social order, and then to compare Him with His loud-voiced followers of today with their imperialism and armaments and wars and worship of wealth. . . . It is not surprising that many people should think that *Bapu* (Gandhi) is far nearer to Christ's teaching than most of his so-called followers in the West today.

The persecution of the Moors in Spain affords this Indian author an opportunity for some observations upon which most of us might reflect with some benefit. After the Arab civilization, built up over a period of seven hundred years, had fallen before the arms of Castille and Aragon, there followed the Christian priests and the Inquisition. "Jews, who had prospered under the Saracens, were now forced to change their religion and many were burnt to death. Women and children were not spared." But stranger were the reasons given for persecuting the Moors themselves:

> The Spanish Christians seem to have been very much against washing and bathing. Perhaps they objected to these simply because the Spanish Arabs were very fond of them and had created great public baths all over the place. The Christians went so far as to issue orders 'for the reformation of the Moriscoes' or Moors or Arabs, that 'neither themselves, their women, nor any other persons, should be permitted to wash or bathe themselves either at home or elsewhere; and that all their bathing houses should be pulled down and destroyed.'

Another Moorish crime was toleration; and Nehru quotes from the "Apostacies and Treasons of the Moriscoes" as defined in 1602 by the Archbishop of Valencia:

> They (the Moriscoes) commended nothing so much as that liberty of conscience in all matters of religion, which the Turks, and all other Mahommedans, suffer their subjects to enjoy.

So the Archbishop recommended their expulsion. It is not uninteresting to reflect that he wrote two years after the formation of the East India Company, the forerunner of a system of government which has never ceased to extol its own Christian virtue as expressed in religious toleration and personal hygiene.

At the end of Nehru's first volume we feel that he is already forming more than a political judgment of the material he has covered.

He pauses, fascinated, over the career and personality of Napoleon. "I shall confess to you that all through my boyhood I had a soft corner in my heart for him," he writes. (Curiously enough, the Indian resembles his Corsican hero in many physical characteristics.) Admitting a bias, he cannot find in Napoleon the mere adventurer that H. G. Wells saw. But he does see him hopelessly corrupted by power.

Nehru tells this part of his story dramatically. He does not fail to note that it was in Napoleon's time that propaganda first became a weapon of war, introduced by the British Government in its struggle with the French. In the end he sees Napoleon fall "a victim to the empty glamour which the old idea of kingship exercised." He quotes Bonaparte's amazing saying: "In the long run the sword will always be conquered by the Spirit," and comments:

> But there was no long run for him. He was in a hurry, and right at the beginning of his career he had chosen the way of the sword; and by the sword he triumphed and by the sword he fell.

He finds his hero guilty of having loved power (and yet, "not crudely, but as an artist") and quotes from his last testament, "In the present day the way is to convince by reason."

Nehru's book is published in India and as yet it has not found an English publisher.

Another book that lies on my desk is Gerald Heard's *Source of Civilization,* recently published by Jonathan Cape.

Gerald Heard attempts to examine the inner cause of many historical phenomena, dwelling rather specially upon the rise and fall of empires; for he notes that their "periodic collapse is perhaps the most striking fact throughout history." It is difficult, he says, to explain why violence should fail at the moment of success. Various theories have been put forward—those of Spengler, for example, and Gibbon's "decline of martial virtues," the latter based (says Heard) on "the heroic saga made to justify aggressive violence. . . . The militarist argument really runs that the only way to preserve martial virtues is always to be fighting and always losing."

The Source of Civilization is as much as anything an attempt to discover a philosophy of history in the answer to this question. All social animals can "scrap," and are liable to quarrel individually. But the man who values, and is valued by, the community will not make a real breach of the peace. He will not let his passion become homicidal.

> Man, then, naturally loses his temper off and on, but the rest of the community as naturally damps him down. What is not natural is for the whole community not merely to lose its temper but in cold blood and with infinite arrangement to get ready to destroy another community.

This development Heard explains from its growth of unnatural relationships between individuals, "so strained that the sword is drawn to 'keep order,' when men are already so divided from their fellows that they allow an armed master to keep and enforce division and inequality." The community then becomes "in the hands of the chief executioner . . . a weapon to divide, scatter and despoil other communities."

Anthropological evidence is called in to prove that primitive man is not naturally warlike. The myth of the ferocious savage is an invention of "those nineteenth century evolutionists, who, we now see, were making a case to their conscience and squaring it with their comfort." What, in plain fact, was "Natural Selection" but an attempt to justify biologically the ruthless competition of the Victorian Age and the cynical doctrine of *laissez faire?*

But the primitive in contact with "civilization" absorbs first whatever has most greatly impressed him.

Is this culture, philosophy, religion or science? Is it even the physical benefits which civilization can bestow upon him? No, his first contact with civilized man commonly results in his realizing new powers of destruction, stirring up fear and the desire for self-defense. From civilization he learns little but the art of war, which he uses first to defend himself and then to attack his barbarian neighbors and civilization itself. Heard shows us that the Romans themselves (as Nehru suggests) were barbarians who throughout their long rule learned little but the art of fighting. "The famous Roman Law is an invention of stoics such as Ulpian . . . It cannot, however, rid itself of violent means. . . .

> It is the great codifier, Ulpian, who has to defend torture. . . . The Law becomes hateful; the State an alien monster.

So a material "civilization" grew up based upon Roman concrete (invented by Greeks) and ruled for the most part by crude barbarians. Heard attributes the long duration of this empire mainly to stupidity. The empires of Alexander, Atilla, Genghis and Timur blew themselves more swiftly to atoms because of the greater dynamic energy and inventive genius that moved them. But stupidity could only slow down the decline of Rome: it could not save it.

> The Mithridatic wars only serve to spur the pugnacity of generals who had sufficient loot and now must conquer for conquest's sake, as a fox kills all the hens in the run from wantonness, needing to eat only one. This passion to destroy, beyond any carnivorous need, is later called glory. The legions must be flung against anything left to smash. . . . If England acquired its Empire in a fit of absence of mind (or rather, by its right hand not looking too closely into the sinister activities of its fellow) Rome acquired its Empire in a frenzy of unplanned pugnacity.

Empires fall for the same reason that they rise—because material "progress" in the specialized field of war has so far outstripped moral development. They have "no Sanctions but the Sword" though they make frantic attempts to stabilize themselves upon a basis of religion and tradition ("perscriptive right").

In modern times new sanctions are sought. George Fox re-discovers "the spirit which taketh away the occasion for all wars." Woolman, following the same tradition, sought passionately for social justice because "he could no longer consider himself a distinct and separate person." But Quakerism, too, becomes corrupted by wealth, which is the most highly developed form of power. Harcourt said in the last century "We are all Socialists now" and Heard adds:

> The pacifism from which all Liberals, including Quakers, hoped so much was not more real. We are all pacifists now, so long as we see that security, honor, expansion, prestige, can be obtained without violence.

Heard sees little hope in Geneva. The statesman's way to peace Heard likens to the edicts of the Middle Ages when Days of Truce were promulgated "like early closing days, to give the harassed workers a little rest," and bishops (who were specifically forbidden to use the sword) wielded a mace.

If we fail, it would appear that we have already too far infected the primitive races with the virus of social violence to hope for a new and better civilization arising out of primitive society when ours has destroyed itself. Nevertheless there is still time and even a way out for our civilization through an active pacifism.

> There is this one way, the only way out, straight and narrow. . . . But we have reached a pass when, if any way is open, we must attempt it—or go over the brink at our feet. . . . Our desperate peril may make us scale the cliff as paralytics will sometimes, if the house is on fire, rise from their beds and clamber both to safety and to a new life of freedom.

Caste and Industrial Progress

C. A. PHADKHAR

The caste system is a negation of the beneficial principle of equality and injures the higher as well as the lower castes. It breeds in the former a false and distorted sense of superiority and in the latter a mental attitude fatal to the development of self-respect. An extreme example of this is offered by the depressed and the untouchable classes, who are subjected to unheard of humiliation and to many disabilities not only social but also economic. The unfortunate victim of this system is constantly a loser in ordinary commercial operations through his inability to enter a shop or even to pass through streets where shop-keepers dwell.

The influence of Western thought and the introduction of so much of the modern machinery of civilization like railways, etc., are tending in some measure to break down the barriers of caste. Owing to the linking up of the village with the outside world and the growth of trade and modern industry an increasing number of people have begun to find it advantageous to give up their old traditional occupations and seek employment in the new mills, mines and workshops. With the growth of commerce and introduction of machinery in production the old social organization has become unsuitable and is bound to be subordinated to the exigencies of economic life.

Western education and culture, university and college life, where the low caste man rubs shoulders with the high caste man, the growth of large towns, the influence of the ruling race, the development of a spirit of scepticism are all undermining the spirit of caste exclusiveness. While reducing amongst the higher classes the inclination to insist on their privileges they are making the lower classes less disposed to admit without question the superior status of the higher castes. Again, there is now only one law applicable without distinction to high and low caste, and the state no longer encourages the pretensions of the higher classes, nor does it favor their admission to the superior posts in government service. On the contrary appointments are now preferably given to the lower castes and a sort of inverted caste system is being introduced. The lower castes are becoming more self-conscious and alive to the necessity of removing their old disabilities by concerted communal action. Various Hindu political leaders have started a "crusade" against the caste system, and Mahatma Gandhi has initiated a movement particularly directed towards the removal of the curse of untouchability.

In spite of all this, however, it would be a mis-

take to suppose that the caste system is moribund. Unfortunately, it still holds its sway in practically unabated strength. We have referred above to the general awakening among the lower castes and, although this is a welcome development in many ways, in practice it is often seen that devotion to one's caste means a fanatical hatred of the superior castes and much energy is thus being wasted in feeding fat the ancient grudge against the higher castes. The new rights conferred on the people by the reform are not infrequently misused for fostering narrow sectional interests to the neglect of the wider national interests, and the various castes with their improved organization and strengthened self-consciousness are made to serve as a ready-made system of standing political causes. While the different castes are giving free vent to their grievances against the caste higher up, they are generally not prepared to treat on terms of perfect equality the castes lower than themselves in the social scale.—Reprinted from *The Indian Social Reformer.*

The Study Table

Hindu Philosophy

INTELLIGENT MAN'S GUIDE TO INDIAN PHILOSOPHY. *By Mannbhai C. Pandya. 468 pp. Bombay: Taraporerata & Sons. Price Rs 10/-.*

GITA RAHASYA OR SCIENCE OF KARMA YOGA. VOL. I. *By Bal Gangadher Tilak. 618 pp. Poona: Tilak Brothers. Price Rs 6/-.*

PATANJALI'S RAJA YOGA. *By Rishi Singh Gherwal. 196 pp. Santa Barbara, California, P. O. Box 533: Published by the author.*

INDISCHE SPHAREN. *By Heinrich Zimmer pp. 247. Munich: R. Oldenbourg.*

To understand a people one should know their ideal of life and thus their philosophy. To understand India one should have comprehension of Indian philosophy "which comprises within its scope all forms and phases of a being's whole activity of body, speech and mind . . . It embraces all regions of human activity." Mr. Mannbhai Pandya has written *Intelligent Man's Guide to Indian Philosophy* with the idea of presenting a comprehensive summary of Hindu religious thought, covering the teachings of the Vedas, Upanishads, Bhagabat Gita, Indian Epics, and the sacred laws and traditions of the Aryans, etc. From this point of view, the book will be valuable and useful to those who wish to get a fundamental idea of the philosophy, religion, ethics, psychology, and social institutions of the Hindus.

The name of Bal Gangadher Tilak is held in reverence by the Indian public, even by Mahatma Gandhi. Tilak is one of the founders of the present movement of Indian Nationalism for Indian independence. He was regarded as an "extremist and seditionist." He was sent to prison on several occasions on charges of spreading disaffection against the British rule in India. Tilak, the Indian Nationalist leader, was a great philosopher. His philosophical ideals and spirit of activity are the spirit of Indian Nationalists who are not materialists but believers in the ideals of Karma Yogi's. Bal Gangadher Tilak while in prison wrote his monumental work on Bhagabat Gita, which has been translated into all the important languages of India. The original work was written in *Marhatti* and the English translation is the work of Bhalchandra Suktankar, Solicitor, High Court, Bombay. Tilak is not an advocate of absolute non-violence, because such a thing is opposed to ethical life which must oppose evil. Tilak regards slavery and all that causes degradation as evil; and believes that one must fight actively to overcome evil and to achieve victory. Tilak takes issue with the doctrine of securing salvation through renunciation, and suggests that Krishna, in the Bhagabat Gita, taught the religion of salvation through right action. The work does not merely deal with Bhagabat Gita, but is a comprehensive and critical study of philosophical ideals of the Hindus as compared with those of Western scholars. This is a book which should be carefully studied by all serious students of comparative religion and philosophy, especially of the teachings of "Gita."

In the work, *Patanjali's Raja Yoga,* Rishi Singh Gherwal presents an excellent commentary of Yoga philosophy which emphasizes that a man attains salvation by achieving the state of being in communion with the Infinite. What are the requisites for self-realization of "Man-in-God" and "God-in-Man?" This book answers the question from the standpoint of Yoga philosophy. Let me quote two interesting Yoga Sutras which will throw some light on its teachings:

"Whose happiness is within, whose relaxation is within, whose light is within, that Yogi alone, becoming Bramha, gains absolute Freedom."

"Disease, languor, indecision, carelessness, sloth, sensuality, mistaken notions, missing the point, instability, these causing distractions or diversion of the mind are the obstacles."

"Ignorance, egoism, attachment, aversion and love of life are all the afflictions."

"Liberation for the Yogi, then, is the realization of the power of consciousness bereft of the afflictions."

In the work *Indische Spharen,* Prof. Heinrich Zimmer, of Heidelberg University, gives a popular account of some of the Hindu Myths, the teachings of Vedanta, Yoga and Buddhist philosophy. The learned author tries to show that the inner meaning of Hindu philosophy and the religious practices are really modern from the standpoint of psychology and development of individuality and formation of character of the highest type. The author gives parallels between the mystical teachings current among Christians and the teachings of Indian Yogis.

TARAKNATH DAS.

Rammohun Roy

THE FATHER OF MODERN INDIA; COMMEMORATION VOLUME OF THE RAMMOHUN ROY CENTENARY CELEBRATIONS, 1933. *Edited by Satis Chandra Chakravati, M. A., Calcutta, 1935. 760 pp., with tricolor reproduction of the Briggs portrait and other illustrations. Five rupees.*

What else and what more might be said of the first great modern religious Liberal and humanitarian

of India, Rammohun Roy, who died in 1833, the reviewer is unable to imagine. Everything seems to be here: accurate biography, scholarly interpretations of Rammohun's work and teachings, eulogies and appraisals from international admirers, programs of local Indian commemoration services, interminable committee lists, the history of the Brahmo Samaj and its present status, bibliographical data. Every phase of the noble, valiant, lovable super-person that Rammohun was is suggested: Catholic Theist, Vedic-Moslem-Parsee-Unitarian Christian savant, synthetizer, sympathizer; chief inceptor of the abolition of suttee, coryphee of modern Hindu literature, pioneer in the advocacy of the emancipation and education of Hindu women, first interpreter of the Occident to the East, first Brahmin to overstep caste and to travel to the West, founder of the Brahmo Samaj, champion of the freedom of the Indian press—Rammohun deserves all that even this monumental and polysyllabic volume says of him. The reviewer endorses specifically the address by Tagore (p. 1); the Life by Sivanath Sastri (p. 7 on second pagination); the articles by Bepin Chandra Pal, (pp. 201 on); that on Rammohun's Universal Humanism by Sir B. N. Seal (p. 371).

One realizes how deplorably introspective, as well as how implicitly Christocentric Boston Unitarianism still is when one reads the good, and yet, relatively speaking, the inadequate part the United States played in the Commemoration, in spite of the heroic efforts of Dr. F. C. Southworth, whose article from the Meadville Bulletin is the best America contributed. It is rather absurd to talk so much about the international Fellowship of Religious Liberals when not one official service was promoted in this country—a striking contrast to London and Paris. As in 1827, Boston is relatively unresponsive; the excellent UNITY article by Dr. Joy is a happy but lonely exception.

CHARLES LYTTLE.
The Meadville Theological School, Chicago.

"If I were to look over the world to find out the country most richly endowed with all the wealth, power and beauty that nature can bestow—in some facts, a very paradise on earth—I should point to India. If I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered on the greatest problems of life and has found solutions of some of them which well deserve the attention even of those who have studied Plato and Kant—I should point to India.

"And if I were to ask myself from what literature we, here in Europe, we who have been nurtured almost exclusively on the thoughts of the Greeks and the Romans and of one Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw that corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more universal: in fact, more truly human, a life not for this life only, but a transfigured and eternal life, again I should point to India."—Max Müller (*India—What Can It Teach Us?*)

The Field

(*Continued from page* 42)

uttering warnings that this move of Dr. Ambedkar was primarily a political move to secure power in the legislatures under the coming constitution and that it had nothing to do with a spiritual quest. But these missionary leaders in their enthusiasm ignored all such warnings as proceeding from lack of a true missionary spirit on the part of Christian Indians, and in the case of non-Christians from a desire to retain the depressed classes within Hinduism. They interpreted this so-called revolt against Hinduism as a spiritual movement, seeking for larger and fuller life and therefore as a clear call to the Christian church to put itself in readiness to receive these millions of depressed classes into its membership.

Even the most ardent supporters of Ambedkar among missionaries now realize the true inwardness of this movement from the correspondence published last week. This was exchanged some weeks ago between Dr. Ambedkar, Dr. Moonje (a leader of the *Hindu Mahasabha,* which is an organization for the preservation of Hindu religion and culture) and Mr. M. C. Rajah, a Hindu depressed class leader of south India. Dr. Moonje and Dr. Ambedkar after mutual consultation evolved a plan by which the depressed classes were to embrace Sikhism, in preference to Islam or Christianity. Sikhism was considered to be within Hindu culture, and if the depressed classes became Sikhs the *Hindu Mahasabha* promised to secure for them the political rights sanctioned by the Poona pact —that is, the right of electing to the various provincial legislatures depressed class members. This right would lapse if the depressed classes became Christians or Moslems. A statement was prepared on this proposal by Dr. Ambedkar, and Mr. Rajah was consulted. It is necessary to quote some parts of this statement to show what is really behind all of this discussion.

Dr. Ambedkar begins by listing the reasons which might influence the depressed classes to join Islam or Christianity. Discussing Islam, he says: "Financially the resources behind Islam are boundless. Socially the Moslems are spread all over India. They can take care of the new converts from the depressed classes and render them help. Politically, the depressed classes will get all the rights which Moslems are entitled to." (The reference here is to the provision for separate electorates for Moslems in the Indian constitution.) Discussing the advantages of embracing the Christian religion he says: "If Indian Christians are too small numerically to provide the financial resources necessary for the conversion of the depressed classes, Christian countries such as America and England will pour out their immense resources if the depressed classes show their readiness to embrace Christianity. Socially the Christian community is numerically too weak to render much support to the converts from the depressed classes, but Christianity has government behind it." He says further that by becoming Christians the depressed classes will have, like Moslems, special electorates.

In the face of these advantages why has Dr. Ambedkar decided in favor of Sikhism? Both Islam and Christianity will denationalize the depressed classes. "If they go to Islam the number of Moslems will be doubled and the danger of Moslem political domination also becomes real. If they go to Christianity the numerical strength of Christians becomes fifty to sixty

The Field

(*Continued from page 58*)

millions. It will help to strengthen the hold of the British on this country. On the other hand, if they embrace Sikhism they will not only not harm but help the destiny of the country. They will not be denationalized. On the contrary, they will be a help in the political advancement of the country. Thus it is in the interest of the country that the depressed classes, if they are to change their faith, should go over to Sikhism." The statement then proceeds to appeal to the Hindus to make Sikhism as good an alternative to the depressed classes as Islam or Christianity, especially in the matter of securing for them political privileges in the new constitution. The most disappointing feature of this statement is that there is not a word said about any of these three religions satisfying the spiritual and religious needs of the depressed classes.

Mr. M. C. Rajah, who has all along been opposed to the proposal that the depressed classes should abandon Hinduism, has replied to Dr. Ambedkar's proposal, characterizing it as "a migration from one community to another for social, economic and political reasons" and therefore unworthy to be called by the name of conversion which is a spiritual change. He says further: "We are not sheep and cattle to be bartered away in this fashion, driven from one political fold to another as a result of a bargain between the leaders of different communities. . . . It is not our purpose to weaken the Hindu community but to strengthen it by reforming it from within. We do not wish to be pawns in the game of communal conflicts and competition."

Dr. Moonje and Dr. Ambedkar claim that Mr. Rajah had no business to publish this correspondence which was "confidential." But its publication has done some real service in exposing the true motives that are behind this conversion proposal of Dr. Ambedkar, of which a great deal is being said and written in missionary circles in America and England.

India Is On Its Way

A tablet commemorating the organization of the Indian National Congress was recently dedicated in Bombay with the following inscription:

Here in this historic hall a band of gallant patriots laid the foundation of the Indian National Congress on December 28, 1885, which during all these fifty years has been built up, stone by stone, tier by tier, by courage, devotion, faith and sacrifice of countless men and women as a pledge and symbol of their invincible purpose to secure to India, their Motherland, her legitimate birthright of Swaraj. This tablet is placed to commemorate its Golden Jubilee.

Indian aspirations for political liberty were derived from the revolutionaries and liberals of England and America. The National Congress embodied these ideas. But before 1919 the rulers of Britain paid little attention to the "fanatics" in India. India's population of 300,000,000 was divided against itself through opposing races, castes and religions; it spoke 222 different languages and dialects; it embodied cleavages of culture, custom, social

(*Continued on page 60*)

FORTHCOMING ARTICLES

THE VISION OF WILLIAM MORRIS—A BRITON'S WAY TO UTOPIA
By David Gittleman

THE EMBARRASSMENT OF RELIGIOUS LIBERALISM
By George Yeisley Rusk

WE AND OUR WORLD
By Jesse H. Holmes

HEARST IN SEATTLE
By Fred W. Shorter

BABSON'S SOFA SERVICES
By George Richmond Grose

THE OLD LADY
By May Stranathan

PEACE AND WAR LEGISLATION IN THE SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS
By Jesse M. MacKnight

THE CANDIDATES AND PEACE
By Philip S. Bernstein

WAR: A NEUROSIS ON THE NATIONAL SCALE
By Paul Plummer Swett

BERTHA VON SUTTNER
By Lucia Ames Mead

DRAGON'S TEETH
By O. A. Hammand

THE UNPEACEFUL PACIFIC
By Dorothy Walton Binder

NECESSITY OF AN AMERICAN-JAPANESE UNDERSTANDING FOR PEACE IN THE PACIFIC
By Taraknath Das

Help Our Drive for More Readers of UNITY

By securing at least one new subscriber within the next thirty days!

Use the attached form.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER BLANK

Please enter the following subscription to UNITY:

Name .....

Street and No. .....

City ..... State .....

$3.00 for a year's subscription.

($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries.)

☐ Remittance enclosed.

☐ Send invoice.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 59)

position, political separatism, and tradition centuries old. How could such a conglomeration of differences ever seek unity and independence?

But the miracle happened, largely through the work of a "ninety-three pound religious mystic, whose sole garb consisted of a loin cloth and shawl, whose symbol of defiance to British power was a lowly spinning wheel, whose spiritual authority gave him precedence over princes, parliament and dominions."

The storm broke in 1919 and has not subsided yet. At first the British tried to check it by military savagery. At the Amritsar Massacre, General Dyer ordered his troops to fire for ten minutes into the unarmed multitudes, killing 379 and wounding 1,200, but this ghastly slaughter did not, of course, solve the Indian problem for the imperialists.

Instead there was enacted one of the most extraordinary chapters in all history. The frail mystic, Gandhi, pitted "spirit power" against military violence—and the great British Empire was shaken to its foundations. No violence, said the Mahatma, and warlike Sikhs sat impassively under the blows of policemen's clubs; readily-roused Moslems quietly accepted beatings in the public streets. The arms of the imperial clubbers were stayed in astonishing incredulity.

There followed a campaign of civil disobedience, a disastrous boycott of British goods, challenge of the British salt monopoly and of the British liquor trade. Manchester was dazed. Up and down the land went the new Indian saint, praying, breaking down caste barriers, uniting the hostile factions; Indian unity was emerging.

The British tried concessions: the Indian Reform Act. Always they withheld vital powers, but always were they pushed into further concessions. The Native Princes threw in their lot with the rest of India and the fear of Indian independence gripped the imperialists. The right of self-government was conceded, but London continued to control India's foreign policy, the army and financial policies.

On the economic side India's situation has changed very little, India continues to be a "province of the City of London," a field for British capital. Enormous rewards are reaped by absentee stockholders, wrung out of the toil and abject poverty of the Indian masses. Millions of underfed serfs with puny bodies and emaciated frames constitute a crying challenge which is greater than the political problem.

But India is on its way. Non-cooperation is changing into active leadership in politics, barriers to unity are being removed and the word "Swaraj" is on all tongues. The influence of Jawarharhal Nehru, President of the Congress, with his emphasis on economic realism, grows steadily.

Tremendous tasks remain to be done: political, economic, social, and religious. Congress leadership tends, not away from mysticism, but toward socialism. Jubilee issues of leading Indian newspapers carried prominently the sentiment of Patrick Henry: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

World Events.

EYES ON WISCONSIN!

Only a few weeks ago the first unemployment insurance benefit check ever issued in the United States was handed to a jobless workman in Madison, and Wisconsin again demonstrated its position of leadership in social and labor legislation.

Only a few weeks ago, too, farm, labor and Progressive Party leaders met in Madison and outlined plans for the establishing of a great national third party to function actively in the next national campaign.

Thus does Wisconsin play a leading part in legislative and political matters and attract the interested attention of the nation. In 1936 it is more than ever true that the eyes of the nation are on Wisconsin.

Carrying Wisconsin's message of liberalism throughout the nation and making journalistic history in the weekly newspaper field is THE PROGRESSIVE, successor to the old La Follette's monthly magazine, published at Madison, Wis. No paid advertising appears in The Progressive. No advertisers' threats distort or suppress its news.

The Progressive is not limited in scope to Wisconsin. Its field is national, and in it you will find the facts about what is going on in the liberal and labor movements throughout the nation.

A special trial subscription offer makes it easy for you to become a reader. For only 20 cents you can receive the next 10 issues of this unique, different publication. Send 20 cents today to:

THE PROGRESSIVE, Dept. N
Madison, Wisconsin

A MONTHLY DIGEST

Every month you will find news in THE ARBITRATOR that was previously unknown to you. Your money back if that promise is not fulfilled.

THE ARBITRATOR presents facts of social significance evaded by other publications. That makes it radical. And it will correct any misstatement discovered. That makes it truthful—more radical.

THE ARBITRATOR has no axe to grind; it is not dull. Not an under-dog itself, yet snappy.

The aim is to outlaw war, abolish poverty, unveil superstition and secure justice. The method is to examine current events as a scientist searches for truth—without bias—with faith in the world as it really is.

Send 25 cents for a six months' trial; or 60 cents for a year's subscription.

114 East 31st St., New York City

WHO'S WHO IN OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

A book of intimate facts about the people who run your government. 136 pages with tables and charts.

Gives party affiliations, place of birth, racial descent, religious and fraternal affiliations, previous occupation and political offices held, and military service rendered, for the president, Supreme Court, cabinet, heads of bureaus, senators and representatives of the U. S. Also contains the Constitution, Declaration of Independence and miscellaneous information on government and political affairs.

For sale by The Fellowship Forum, 1065 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D. C. Price: 50 cents, stamps or coin.

Order your copy today.